DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 964 EC 182 750

AUTHOR Spence, Kathleen L.; And Others
TITLE Summary Report of a 1985 Survey of Special Education Students.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Dept. of Special Education.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 105p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Planning; *Demography; *Disabilities; Graduate Students; National Surveys; *Special Education Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Background; *Teacher Education; Teacher Supply and Demand; Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

A survey of demographic, educational, and career plan information was completed by 2,307 graduate and undergraduate special education majors in 148 institutions of higher education in the United States. Findings are reported for demography (gender, citizenship, age, family characteristics, and parental occupational background); educational background (high school attended, previous enrollment status, work status, program location, factors influencing selection of the institution of higher education, satisfaction with current institution, and financial support); and career plans (intention of pursuing a career in special education, type of community, type of school, type of student, type of classroom, adequacy of training, career aspiration, reasons for pursuing graduate training, alternative careers, and career counseling). Among findings were that 90% intended to pursue a career in special education as a teacher or consultant/specialist and the majority preferred to teach mildly handicapped (specifically learning disabled) students at the elementary level in a self-contained public school class. Conflicts were revealed regarding students' preference for surburban over urban or rural and elementary over secondary placements. Thirty-eight data tables are interspersed throughout the report, and a 7-page reference list is provided. The 9-page survey instrument is included as an appendix. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED269964

SUMMARY REPORT OF A 1985 SURVEY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

Kathleen L. Spence, Margaret M. Noel

Kathy Boyer-Shick

August, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen L. Spence

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC182750

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Scholastic Characteristics	1
Personality Characteristics	6
General Characteristics of Teachers	10
Method	19
Questionnaire	22
Data Collection	23
Data Analysis	23
Results and Discussion	24
Students Attending a State or Private Institution of Higher Education	25
Demographic Characteristics	
Student's Gender	27
Citizenship	27
Student's Age	30
Family Characteristics	30
Ethnic Characteristics	30
Occupational Background of Parents	35
Educational Background	
High School Attended	37
Previous Attendance at a Two-Year Institution	40
Student Status	44
Enrollment Status	44

Work Status 47
Location of the Program 47
Factors Influencing IHE Selection 47
Satisfaction with Current Institution 52
Financial Support
Non-Refundable Sources 54
Refundable Sources 54
Career Plans
Intentions of Pursuing a Career in Special Education 57
Type of Community 57
Type of School 57
Type of Student 61
Type of Classroom 61
Adequacy of Training 64
Career Aspiration 64
Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Training 68
Alternative Career 68
Career Counseling 72
Summary 74
References 80
Appendix A

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number of Institutions of Higher Education Surveyed	20
2	Student Sample by Program Type	21
3	Return Rate by Type of Program	25
4	Type of Institution of Higher Education	26
5	Student's Gender	28
6	Citizenship	29
7	Age of Students	31
8	Marital Status	32
9	Number of Dependents	33
10	Ethnic Origin	34
11	Description of Parents of All Students	36
12	Percent of Parents with a College Degree	38
13	Type of High School Attended	39
14	Percent of Students Having Attended a Two-Year institution	41
15	Degrees Attained	42
16	Area of Concentration	43
17	Student Status	45
18	Percent of Students Enrolled Full-Time	46
19	Work Status	48
20	Percent Currently Teaching Regular Education	49
21	Location of College	49
22	Distance from Current College to Home	50

23	Factors Influencing Decision to Attend the Current Institution	51
24	Satisfaction with Current Institution	53
25	Sources of Financial Support: Non-Refundable	55
26	Sources of Financial Support: Refundable	56
27	Percent of Students Intending to Pursue a Career in Special Education	58
28	Type of Community	59
29	Type of School	60
30	Type of Student	62
31	Type of Classroom	63
32	Adequacy of Special Education Training	65
33	Career Aspirations	66
34	Percent Planning to Pursue Graduate Training in Special Ed.	67
35	Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Training	69
36	Alternative Plans After Graduation	70
37	Reasons for Not Remaining in Special Education	71
38	Adequacy of Career Counseling	73

INTRODUCTION

In spite of the vast amount of information describing teacher training programs and teachers in general, relatively little information exists describing the characteristics of those preparing to become special education teachers. Some information on special educators is available within the context of the literature on general education and a few articles have focused on the scholastic and personality characteristics of special education teachers. Since the research is sparse, we will begin with an overview of the literature on education majors and teachers in general and then review the available literature that specifically addresses special educators. This literature review will serve the purpose of determining what information is available describing the characteristics of students and will also show what characteristics of special education majors remain unexplored by researchers.

This review includes the relevant published literature as well as documents, reports, and presentations accessed through ERIC. Dissertations and government publications were excluded from this review.

Scholastic Characteristics

Public scrutiny of education in America has raised concern about the qualifications of those in the teaching profession. Compared with other professions and highly skilled occupations, teaching affords candidates easy access

and provides a significant step up the social class ladder for many of lower and working-class backgrounds. As Lortie (1975) remarked, "Among the occupations of above-average social rank teaching has continued to be marked by easy entry. Entrants need not take the risks involved in acquiring a fee-for-service clientele, and the admission to professional preparation has been relatively simple" (p.31). There is growing evidence that education majors, as a group, are less academically able than other college majors; that graduates are not as academically proficient as other categories of college graduates; and, some education graduates do not perform as well on tests of academic achievement (Feistritzer, 1983; Schlechty and Vance, 1981).

Examining data available from 10 teacher preparation programs Weaver (1978) found that without exception falling test scores and declining enrollments were prevalent. A recent study by Sykes (1983) documents the declining national trend in the SAT and GRE scores of education majors from 1974 to 1980. Examining these trends he concluded: "In short, a mass of evidence converges to show that academic ability of an education major is both low and declining. Teaching appears to attract the least academically able and to be decreasingly attractive" (p. 25).

Several forces converged to alter the academic profile of perspective teachers. Expanding job opportunities for women affected the number of applicants to teacher training programs. It seems that with greater career opportunities

available in less traditional fields such as law and medicine, the academically able woman, who previously had few options other than teaching, opt out of education (Schlechty, 1984; Schlechty and Vance, 1981; Travers, 1980).

In the 1970s teaching positions were limited due to a teacher surplus. Reviewing teacher employment data from national and individual state sources Weaver (1978) states: "The proportion of new graduates entering teaching nationally has dropped from 71 percent in the period 1952-1964 to approximately 52 percent in 1974...The teacher surplus might be estimated as one-fifth of those graduates who are prepared to teach and meet minimum requirements for certification from 1969 to 1975. That total would be approximately 5,000 potential teachers "(p. 559).

The depressed job market discouraged students from entering the teaching profession. The 1970 Census of the Population indicated that 40% of all professional women were classified as school teachers but in the National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972, only 25% of high school students chose teaching as a profession (Falk, Falkowski, & Lyson, 1981). In a national study of 175 preservice teacher training programs, Yarger, Howey, and Joyce (1978) report that from 1973-1975, enrollment dropped about 20% in elementary and secondary education, with male enrollments especially declining. However, there was about a 30% increase in enrollments in special education.

In response to shrinking enrollments departments of education in some colleges of education responded by instituting open admission policies (Sykes, 1983) and lower admission standards (Smith, 1980). At the same time, several prominent libral arts colleges eliminated their department of education due to budget cuts and imposing state certification requirements (Travers, 1980). According to Weaver (1979), the combination of all these factors directly affects the quantity and quality of those entering the teaching profession.

The need for competent teachers prompted states to take action. Beginning in the 1970s, state departments of education began to revise certification standards making completion of an undergraduate or graduate teacher training program a requirement, emergency certifications in regular education were restricted, and some states required the equivalent of five-year programs for permanent certification (Travers, 1980; Howey, Yarger, & Joyce, 1978). Many states considered undergraduate training a minimum standard for certification and required all teachers to maintain certification with continuing education or inservice training credits and eventually receive a master's degree. Additionally, Schlechy and Vance (1982) report that, as of 1981, over half the states were considering some form of test of academic ability to screen prospective teachers.

Even though academic ability is perhaps only one indicator of a "good" teacher several researchers have

documented its importance. The positive significant correlation between teachers' verbal ability and measures of verbal achievement of students in elementary and high school were established by Coleman et al., (1966) and reaffirmed by Bowels and Levin (1968) and Hanuchek (1970). In addition, research evidence reveals that good grades in college correlates with subsequent success in teaching on a number of competencies (Guthrie, 1971; Perry 1981; Weaver, 1978).

The question arises as to whether special educators differ academically from those in other areas of education. Meisgeier (1965) found a positive, significant relationship between scholastic aptitude and achievement and successful student teaching for teachers of mentally or physically handicapped children. Using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Garrison and Scott (1961) found that special education majors showed a greater need for achievement than general education majors. In a study by Rudloff (1969), teachers of the hearing impaired had more graduate degrees, diversified teaching experience, and membership in school affiliated organization than did regular education teachers. Yager and Joyce (1978) found that most special education programs are at the 5th year level and beyond, and an analysis of the certification standards for special education indicates most states currently require professional study in special education in addition to an area of general education (Algozzine, 1982).

In the ten year period since the passage of Public Law 94-142 in 1975, colleges and universities expanded their special education programs to meet the demand for teachers in all areas of exceptionality. In a national survey of teacher training programs, Geiger (1983) identified 698 colleges and universities offering training in one or more areas of exceptionality at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels.

Personality Characteristics

Several researchers (Badt, 1957; Blackwell, Chandler, & Sewell, 1980; Garrison & Scott, 1961; Meisgeier, 1965; Scheuer, 1971; Westling, Koorland, & Rose, 1981) have attempted to describe and quantify characteristics of effective special education teachers. In a study aimed at defining characteristics of superior teachers of mentally handicapped or physically handicpped students, Meisgeier (1965) examined five facets of behavior in 41 student teachers. These independent variables were: a) academic aptitude, b) academic achievement; c) vocational interest; d) personality; and e) attitudes toward teaching and student. Several measurement instruments were used for data collection including academic transcripts, admissions records, The Evaluation Record for Teachers of Handicapped Children (ERTHC) to evaluate student teacher effectiveness, and a battery of standardized tests. Three patterns of successful student teachers emerged.

> They were found (a) to be well adjusted, emotionally stable, able to successively encounter the many trying situations that arise in a special class,(b) to possess the physical energy, the vitality and enthusiasm necessary to meet the demands of special class teaching, and (c) to obtain high scores on measures of scholastic achievement and general ability or intelligence and to possess a favorable attitude toward teaching and children. (p. 231)

Using surpervisor ratings of teacher effectiveness ratings by students and teachers on the Teacher-Pupil Relationship Inventory, and measures of students' academic gains, Scheuer (1971) examined the relationship between personality attributes and the effectiveness of teachers of the emotionally disturbed. An analysis was conducted to determine if four personality variables: congruence, empathic understanding, level of regard, and unconditionality of regard, correlated with the academic gain of the emotionally disturbed students. The findings revealed that all the variables, except "level of regard", correlated positively with academic gain. The author concluded that for the most part, students who rated their teachers more positively on these variables, were more likely to demonstrate significant gains in academic achievement.

A more recent study in this area was conducted by Westling, Koorland, and Rose (1981). They sought to examine the characteristics, classroom strategies, and experiences of "average" and "superior" special education teachers. A total of 79 "superior" and 60 "average" teachers, as perceived by their supervisor, participated in the study. Teachers completed the Special Education Teacher Profile which was developed by the authors and so designed to focus on seven areas: personal/professional, preservice/inservice preparation, teaching activities, class management, evaluation, professional interaction, and involvement with parents. Analysis of the data produced two major conclusions. First, the majority of the teachers rated superior by their supervisors tended to have more formal education, particularly at the graduate level, more practicum experience during preservice preparation, and more teaching experience with exceptional children. Second, these superior teachers were judged to be more closely implementing those requirements of Public Law 94-142 such as evaluation, professional and parental interaction. In addition, the majority of these teachers developed their own curriculum allowing for greater individualization in the classroom.

Attempting to develop a profile of the "ideal" special education teacher, Wakefield and Crowl (1974) asked subjects to rank, in order of importance, 15 personality traits defined in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS).

Professors of special education, special education teachers, and undergraduate and graduate special education majors participated in the study. Finding a considerable degree of consensus among respondents, the authors formulated the following profile.

> The ideal teacher is seen as one who has the desire to analyze the behavior and motives of others, to predict how others will act, to assist others less fortunate, to sympathize and show affection for the sick or hurt, to work without interruption, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, and to do a difficult job well. Similarly, the ideal teacher is seen as one who has relatively little need to make fun of others, to display anger, feel depressed by inability to handle situation, to feel generally inferior to others, to be preoccupied with sexuality or to be the center of attention and talk about personal achievements. (p. 87)

The results of the study by Wakefield and Crowl support the findings of other special education research concerning teacher characteristics using the EPPS. For example, Morrison's (1968) findings that a teacher of the mentally retarded ranked highest in the need for "intraception" and lowest in the aggression need. The results also corroborate Garrision and Scott's (1961) finding that special education students score high on the need for achievement and low on the need for succorance.

Blackburn, Chandler, and Sowell (1980) examined the relationship between attitudes toward exceptional children and observable teaching behavior of 30 undergraduates before and after a practicum experience. The authors used the Minnesota Teachers Attitude Inventory (MTAI) as a pre-post measure of student attitudes and used the Indiana Behavior Management System to measure teacher-student interaction. Results of the correlational analysis revealed that teacher attitudes did not change with the practicum experience; they remained positive on both pretest and posttests. The authors surmised that the process of choosing to enter special education is self-selective -- students had already developed positive attitudes toward handicapped students. The data also indicated that these special education trainees' positive attitudes were reflected in their teaching behaviors as evidenced by the preponderance of on-task behaviors for both students and teacher trainees.

General Characteristics of Teachers

Who chooses education as a profession? In our society, females dominate the teaching profession. The overrepresentation of women in education, according to Lortie (1975), can be attributed to social factors influencing women's career options. "Not only does our society say teaching is appropriate work for women, but the division of labor in family life makes teaching particularly attractive to women" (p. 52).

A person's socioeconomic origin may also influence the decision to become a teacher. While many postulate teachers come from "lower middle class" backgrounds (Coffman, 1911; Greenhoe, 1941; Moffett, 1929), Pavalko (1970) however, found a disproportionate number of women of high socioeconomic backgrounds choosing education as a profession in a sample of high school seniors participating in a longitudinal study in Wisconsin. Pavalko's analysis involved data from two surveys - a survey taken in 1957 of all high school students in Wisconsin and a followup survey of a sample of that population in 1964. The results indicated that while community size was not a selective factor in the recruitment of teachers, those from smaller communities are more likely to continue teaching. In addition, while teachers are recruited disproportionately from girls of higher measured intelligence, those of lower measured intelligence continue working and teachers who did graduate work are more likely to continue to work than those who did not.

Two other studies specifically examined factors influencing high school students' choice of teaching as a career. Schwarzweller and Lyson (1978) surveyed youth from rural communities in the United States, Norway, and Germany. The U.S. sample included high school seniors from three regions of Kentucky (1968) and a West Virginia coal county (1970). The independent variables under investigation were: students' residence (open country or small village=rural;

town or large village=urban); scholastic rank (cumulative grade average in high school coded into upper one-third vs. lower two-thirds); father's occupation (manual vs. non-manual); and sex. The dependent variable, occupational career plan, was coded into three categories: teaching, other professions, and all other occupational choices.

Highlighting the results of the U.S. students, Schwarzweller and Lyson, found teaching the most popular professional career choice of rural youth, especially girls. Of those students aspiring to professional careers, 80% of the girls and 30% of the boys wanted to become teachers. Boys, the authors reasoned, seem to recognize and/or have access to a wider and more varied range of professional career options. The results indicated that teaching is a more popular career goal among those from working class families, possibly because ambitious working class youths are likely to focus upon teaching as an appropriate strategy for attaining professional status if other professional options are limited.

Scholastic ability was found to have little effect upon the relative popularity of teaching among high school girls. But lower achieving boys were more likely to consider teaching as a profession than their more talented classmates. In summary, Schwarweller and Lyson state, "Clearly, in rural America, a career in teaching represents an important means by which lower status youths and girls in

general can enhance their lot and hope to achieve a modest degree of upward mobility" (p.42).

Replicating the analytical approach of Schwarweller and Lyson, Falk, Falkowski, and Lyson (1981) used data from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS) to examine career trends of high school students. Again, sex, residence, scholastic rank, and father's occupation were examined with the addition of race. The sample included 831 blacks and 7,700 whites. The results of the analysis led authors to conclude that in 1972 "(a) teaching may not be as popular a vocational pursuit as it once was, especially for blacks and women, and (b) that the factors most related to becoming a teacher may have less to do with residence, father's occupation, scholastic performance or race than with sex"(p. 68).

The difference in the results of the two studies was due, in part, to the national scope of the NLS data, but according to Falk and colleagues, the decline in popularity of teaching can also be attributed to increasing professional options available to women and blacks as well as the impact of the depressed job market for teacher in the 1970s.

The study by Falk, et al., is of particular interest as it tests the claim that teaching historically has been an avenue of upward mobility of minorities. According to 1970 census data for all professions, 45% of black women and 20% of black men were classified as teachers. The NLS data however, show that no black males located in the upper rank

of scholastic performance chose teaching, while more black females in the upper than in the lower rank choose it. The authors suggest this is due to the fact young black males, in particular, have begun to perceive alternative avenues of upward mobility historically restricted.

Taking a different approach Page and Page (1982) examined "encouraging factors" in the teaching profession. The study surveyed 387 perservice teachers and 315 inservice teachers in 10 southeastern states. Only 14% of the preservice teachers and 16% of the inservice teachers viewed salary as an encouraging factor of teaching. A larger percentage viewed social status, 54% of preservice teachers and 44% of inservice teachers, as an encouraging factor. A wide discrepancy existed between their perceptions of working conditions; 72% of preservice teachers 49% of inservice teachers viewed work conditions as an encouraging factor. Interestingly, 71% of preservice teachers but only 59% of inservice teachers stated they would enjoy or are enjoying their work. Both groups, 90% of preservice teachers and 85% of inservice teachers, considered their contribution to humanity an encouraging factor.

Two other findings deserve mention. Page and Page found only 40% of preservice teacher and 48% of inservice teachers considered the teaching profession a good profession for a male to enter as opposed to 98% of preservice teachers and 88% of inservice teachers who thought it was a good profession for women. According to

the respondents of this survey, teaching is still perceived as a woman's profession. The other finding concerns career plans. Seventy-one percent of preservice teachers and 72% of inservice teachers plan to teach until retirement an indication of a strong commitment to the profession.

One large study that included special education majors was an exploration of selective demographic characteristics and career plans of undergraduate students enrolled in teacher training programs. The National Survey of the Preservice Preparation of Teachers, sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics, was conducted by Dr. Bruce Joyce and colleagues between 1975 and 1977. Questionnaires were distributed to 15 students randomly selected from each of the 200 schools surveyed. The students selected were enrolled in student teaching - 74.6% were juniors or seniors, and 17.1% were in their 5th year. Survey results were based on the responses of 2231 students representing 175 schools. The following student profile emerged.

> About a quarter of the students are over 25 year old and about a third of them are married. For the most part, their support for the cost of their education is paid by themselves or their families. A large portion of students attend colleges which are relatively close to their homes (over two-thirds within 100 miles). Their overall ethnicity approximates the national

> average., but minority persons tend to be concentrated in the large comprehensive teaching colleges. Students tend to select teaching because of a liking for children, and most of them expect to find jobs and teach although they are realistic about the problems of the job market. The faculty however, expected that only about one-third of the students who enter professional study will graduate, subsequently find a job, and also continue beyond a year or two.(Joyce, Yarger, Howey, Harbeck, & Kluwin, 1977, p. 2)

Special education majors made up about 15% of the national sample of perservice teachers. The profile of special education students closely resembled other students in teacher education in other words, predominantly female, Caucasian, in their mid 20s, single, and a majority living in the state in which their college or university was located. The only differences found between those enrolled in special education versus other teacher education programs was that fewer males were enrolled in special education programs and somewhat more students in special education came from urban areas. Joyce et al., also noted that special education departments were more common in the major comprehensive teaching institutions, and the number of students enrolled in Special Education was growing steadily at both the bachelor's and master's levels.

Using a national sample of direct service personnel, Algozzine, Schmid, and Wells (1982) attempted to characterize teachers of emotionally disturbed adolescents. Teachers (N=320) representing all fifty states volunteered to completed the National Secondary School Survey (NSSS) regarding their characteristics, those of their students, and the educational program in general. Of the sample of secondary level ED teachers, 62% were female and a high percentage were young (less than 32 years of age). The ED teachers tended to be certified at all levels (K-12), 65% were certified to teach ED, 36% also certified in LD and 47% held certificates in other areas. Thirty-one percents were enrolled in Master's degree programs. The predominant service delivery model was a resource room (55%) followed by self-contained classroom (23%).

The findings of these studies provides some information about the characteristics of special education teachers but researchers by and large have focused their attention on teachers in general education. A descriptive study with special education majors as the sample would prove useful for two reasons. It could serve to develop baseline data for future comparisons to follow trends in the characteristics of those choosing to become teachers of exceptional children. Individuals involved in teacher preparation programs could better target their recruitment efforts if the reasons why a student enters special

education as well as his/her career aspirations were identified.

As part of a federally funded Knowledge Base Project, we sought to gather information about students currently enrolled in undergraduate and graduate special education teacher training programs. The purpose of the study was two fold. First, we attempted to obtain basic demographic and educational background information on students enrolled in these programs. Second, we sought to identify the career plans and preferences of these students.

METHOD

The target population included undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in special education teacher training programs in the United States. Since a list of students currently enrolled in such programs was unavailable, we selected students from institutions of higher eduction (IHEs) known to offer training in special eduction. A two-stage sampling strategy was developed to select a sample of students for the study.

The first stage involved identifying IHEs offering special education teacher training at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels and then selecting a sample based on size of enrollment in the special education program. This information was available from data collected as part of the 1983 National Directory of Special Education Teacher Preparation Programs (Geiger, 1983). The Directory listed 698 IHEs, of which 507 had provided enrollment figures for their 1980-81 academic year. We first stratified these 507 schools according to the type of program offered: those offering undergraduate training only (UI), those offering graduate training only (GI), and comprehensive programs offering both undergraduate (UII) and graduate (GII) training. Next, within each stratum we ranked IHEs from smallest to largest enrollment and randomly selected a sample of schools proportional to the total of the strata yielding a sample of 168 programs. Ten programs were dropped from this sample because the training program was no longer

offered (see Data Collection) yielding a final sample of 158 IHEs representing all but seven states (AK, DE, ME, NH, ND, RI, WA).

Table 1

Number of Institutions of Higher Education Surveyed

Type of Program	N	Dropped	n
Undergraduate program only	161	(6)	48
Graduate program only	88	(1)	28
Both Undergraduate and Graduate programs	258	(3)	82
Total	507		158

The second stage of the sampling plan involved developing a strategy for selecting students from the 158 IHEs. To account for the disparity in the size of the IHE programs -- enrollments ranged from 3 to 954 -- we divided the sample schools into quartiles to proportionately sample students. At this time we also broke the comprehensive programs into undergraduate and graduate categories thereby producing four types of training programs. The number of

Table 2

Student Sample by Program Type

	Quartile I				Quartile II				Quartile III				Quartile IV				Totals	
Type of Program	Enrollment Ranges	No. of Schools	No. Sampled Per School	N	Enrollment Ranges	No. of Schools	No. Sampled Per School	N	Enrollment Ranges	No. of Schools	No. Sampled Per School	N	Enrollment Ranges	No. of Schools	No. Sampled Per School	N	Schools N	Students N
Undergraduate only (UI)	3-37	26	10	231	38-69	13	20	260	80-114	5	50	250	122-370	4	65	260	48	1001
Undergraduate Comprehensive (UII)	13-120	53[a]	10	482	141-225	17	15	225	229-417	8	20	157	420-710	5	40	200	83	1064
Graduate only (GI)	4-100	18	10	175	104-205	7	25	150	350-566	2	65	130	833	1	75	75	28	530
Graduate Comprehensive (GII)	3-96	55[a]	10	438	100-185	17	15	254	191-400	8	25	200	530-732	3	50	150	83	1042
Total																	158	3637

[a] Schools in these categories represent a duplicated count.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students surveyed from each type of program within each quartile ranged from 10 to 100. Table 2 presents the student sample by program type. A total of 3,637 questionnaires were distributed to 158 IHEs.

Questionnaire

The Special Education Student Survey - 1985 (see Appendix A) was adapted from the instrument developed by Joyce, Morra, and Kuuskraa (1975) for the "National Survey of the Preservice Preparation of Teachers." The adapted instrument was piloted in 2 classes of graduate and undergraduate students at the University of Maryland. As a result of this pilot minor modifications were made and a final questionnaire was drafted. The survey form contained three types of questions:

Basic Demographic Information - age, sex, and ethnic representation.

Educational Background - high school and higher education experiences; factors influencing the choice of college and satisfaction with that institution; and, financial resources available to meet college expenses.

Career Plans - intent to pursue a career in special education, the type of student, class, school and community students prefer teaching, and plans to pursue graduate training.

Data Collection

Each department chair was personally contacted to request their permission and assistance in distributing questionnaires to students in their special education program. If the program was no longer available at the IHE, it was dropped from the sample. To make the distribution of questionnaires as efficient as possible, we requested that the chair distribute the surveys to undergraduate students in a pre-practicum class or an upper-level methods class and to graduate students who were at the second semester or above.

Survey distribution took place during January and February, 1985. A packet of questionnaires along with a letter of instruction was sent to the chairperson who distributed the survey to students in the appropriate class. Attached to each survey was a letter of introduction containing instructions for survey completion and a self-addressed return envelope. Student response was voluntary.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Subprograms Frequencies and Crosstabs were used to provide descriptive data regarding the characteristics of the special education student sample.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 2,307 usable questionnaires were received representing 148 programs. Return rates ranged from 54.3% to 64.2% for the four types of programs, with an overall return of 63.4% (Table 3). Data for the descriptive variables were crosstabulated by type of training offered coded as undergraduate training only (UI), graduate training only (GI), undergraduate training in comprehensive programs (UII), and graduate training in comprehensive prorams (GII). Relative frequences are presented rather than raw frequencies due to the difference in sample size for each type of program. Also, data for some variables combine programs types because differences between groups were minimal.

Students Attending a State or Private Institution of Higher Education

We were interested in knowing the type of college or university students attended in terms of whether it was a state supported or private institution of higher education (IHE). Table 4 displays IHE type for each program category. For our sample, the highest percentage of private schools (49.6%) is in the category of those schools offering only undergraduate training (UI) while state schools outnumber private almost 4 to 1 in comprehensive programs offering both undergraduate and graduate training (UII and GII).

Table 3

Return Rate by Type of Program

Type of Program	Quartile I Schools n	Quartile I Students n	Quartile I Percent Return	Quartile II Schools n	Quartile II Students n	Quartile II Percent Return	Quartile III Schools n	Quartile III Students n	Quartile III Percent Return	Quartile IV Schools n	Quartile IV Students n	Quartile IV Percent Return	Totals Schools n	Totals Students n	Totals Percent Return
Undergraduate Only (UI)	25	167	72.2	12	175	67.30	5	134	53.60	4	167	64.23	46	643	64.24
Undergraduate Comprehensive (UII)	43	330	68.46	13	171	76.00	6	134	85.35	5	136	68.00	67	771	72.46
Graduate Only (GI)	16	115	65.71	7	113	75.33	2	45	34.62	1	15	20.0	26	288	54.34
Graduate Comprehensive (GII)	42	277	63.24	16	149	58.66	8	107	53.50	3	72	48.0	69	605	56.96
Total													148	2307	63.43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Type of Institution of Higher Education

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
State	50.2	86.9	64.6	79.0
Private	49.6	13.1	35.4	21.0

[a]"no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Student's Gender

The survey asked students several questions concerning basic demographic information. As Table 5 illustrates, females dominate the teaching profession. In all but one category, females enrolled in special education teacher training programs outnumber males 9 to 1 with the strongest male representation (11.1%) in programs offering only graduate training.

The low representation of males particularly for undergraduate in comprehensive programs (UII), may be cause for concern. In 1975 Joyce et al., reported that about half as many males were in special education programs (15.7%) as all undergraduate education programs combined (28.7%). Algozzine et al., (1982) reported that 38% of the 320 teachers in their national sample were men. Our data seem to reflect the trend for males to choose professions other than education and for the teaching profession to become increasingly a female dominated profession.

Citizenship

Almost all students enrolled in special education programs are citizens of the United States (Table 6). However, the percent of students from other countries training at the graduate level is double that at the undergraduate level.

Table 5

Students' Gender

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Male	9.6	.5.8	11.1	9.9
Female	90.4	93.9	88.9	90.1

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 6

Citizenship

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
U.S. citizen	98.8	98.5	97.2	96.9
Other citizenship	1.2	1.5	2.8	2.9

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for difference from 100%.

Student's Age

Students responding to the survey ranged in age from 18 to 69 years (Table 7). Not suprising, over 70 percent of the undergraduates are between the ages of 18 and 22 and the mean age was 23 years. For graduates, the mean age is 30. Although the highest percentage of graduates are between the ages of 23 and 29 (GI=46.9%, GII=43.7%), graduate training seems to attract a relatively large percentage of individuals between 30 and 40 years of ages; 29.3% for schools offering only graduate training (GI) and 38.9% for comprehensive training programs (GII).

Family Characteristics

Approximately half the graduates are married versus 18% of the undergraduates (Table 8). The majority of students reported having no children (Table 9). Of those students reporting dependents, the highest percentage have 1 or 2 children.

Ethnic Characteristics

The ethnic characteristics of the students are presented in Table 10. The overwhelming majority (88% to 93.9%) of special education trainees are Caucasian with a relatively low percentage of students representing minority populations. In 1975 Joyce and colleagues reported that 87.5% of all undergraduate education majors in their sample were Caucasian followed by 7.8% Black, 1.2% Asian, and .6% Hispanic. Compaired to the 1980 National Census data, the

Table 7

Age of Students

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
18-22	75.6	70.1	8.4	8.6
23-29	11.2	17.5	46.9	43.7
30-35	5.8	6.9	16.7	26.8
36-40	4.3	2.5	13.5	12.1
41-69	3.0	2.9	14.2	8.2

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" account for the difference from 100%.

Table 8

Marital Status

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Single	80.1	78.6	50.3	43.5
Married	17.7	19.5	44.8	52.4
Other	2.2	1.7	4.9	3.9

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for difference from 100%.

Table 9

Number of Dependents

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
0	85.8	84.6	63.9	57.8
1-2	9.2	11.4	24.0	32.1
3-4	3.9	3.8	10.8	8.7
5 or more	1.1	.3	1.4	1.4

[a] "no response" or "error in responding"accounts for difference from 100%.

Table 10

Ethnic Origin

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII	U.S. Census 1980
Black	2.8	3.9	1.4	6.9	11.7
Caucasian	93.9	90.4	90.6	88.4	83.2
Asian	1.1	.4	3.8	1.0	1.1
Hispanic	.3	3.5	.3	2.0	6.4
Indian	.9	.3	.7	.2	.6
Other	.9	.8	2.1	.9	--

[a] "no response" or "error in response" accounts for difference from 100%.

percentage of Caucasian students enrolled in all four types of programs is above the percent of Caucasians in the population. The weakest representation of minorities are in those IHEs offering only undergraudate (UI) or only graduate training (GI). This may be due in part to the fact that, for our sample, these schools were more likely to be private whose minority student populations have decreased due to cutbacks in financial support. Blacks and hispanics show the strongest representation in graduate programs of IHEs offering both types of training; even so, their representation is below that of their representation in the population.

Occupational Background of Parents

Because education majors have typically come from families who are non-professionals or first generation college graudates, we were interested in knowing the principal occupation of these students' parents. The quesionnnaire listed 10 occupations corresponding to the department of labor categories.

The results of these data presented in Table 11 represents the responses of all students - all four types of programs combined. The leading occupations for fathers were: manager (16.3%), other professional (16.1%), craftsman (12.6%), and owner (10.3%). Just over 6% indicated their father's occupation was in the field of education.

Table 11

Description of Parents of All Students

Occupation	Father	Mother
Clerical	1.9	22.8
Craftsman	12.6	.8
Farmer	5.7	.6
Homemaker	.1	32.2
Laborer	5.4	1.1
Manager	16.3	3.9
Military	2.3	.0
Operative	7.5	2.2
Educator	6.7	11.4
Other Professional	16.1	10.2
Owner	10.3	2.5
Protective Services	1.8	.2
Sales	6.4	3.8
Service	1.2	4.7
Technical	3.6	.7

An entirely different pattern emerged for the mothers of these students. More than 32% of the students reported their mother's principal occupation as homemaker, followed by clerical (22.8%), education (11.4%) and other professions (10.2%) which included nurses. Thus, it seems mothers have maintained more traditional occupational roles.

The survey also asked students to indicate if either their father or mother held a college degree. Almost 22% of the fathers and approximately 15% of the mothers of these special education students hold a college degree(Table 12).

Educational Background

High School Attended

Over 84% of the sample indicated they had attended a public high school (Table 13). The percentage of students having attended a private/parochial high school ranged from 9.6% (GII) and 14.9% (GI). These percentages reflect the same pattern Joyce et al., reported a decade ago as 83.2% of their undergraduate sample had attended a public high school and 12.1% attended a private/parochial high school.

From the small percentage of graduate (GI=4.2%, GII=4.1%) and undergraduate (UI=.9%, UII=1.5%) students from private/secular high schools it seems education is not a popular career choice among high school students from this type of high school.

Table 12

Percent of Parents with a College Degree

	Father[a]	Mother
Yes	21.5	15.3
Blank	78.4	84.7

[a] "No response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 13

Type of High School Attended

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Public	83.8	84.9	79.9	85.8
Private/parochial	14.6	12.2	14.9	9.6
Private/secular	.9	1.5	4.2	4.1
Fed. Government School	.2	.4	.3	.2
Other	.5	.5	.7	.2

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Previous Attendance at a Two-Year Institution

We asked students several questions concerning their previous college experiences. Table 14 shows, the percent of students who previously attended a two-year institution. Looking only at the undergraduates, between 20 and 31 percent of our sample attended such a program. This is not unexpected considering Peng (1977) found that about 24% of the students entering a four-year institution of higher education transfer from a two-year college. Joyce et al., also found nearly a fourth of their undergraduate sample had attended a two-year college.

These data correspond to information regarding degrees students have thus far attained (Table 15). The highest percent of students holding an AA degree are students from comprehensive programs (UII=15.5%, GII=12.8%). In addition to a Bachelor's degree, more than 15% of the graduates already hold graduate degree - a Master's or beyond.

Areas of concentration for each degree attained were obtained using an open-ended question. Responses were then coded as: Special Education, General Education, or Other. The results of these data are presented in Table 16. Suprisingly, a few students indicated that they obtained special education training at the Associates Degree level. At the Bachelor's level more graduates attending comprehensive programs majored in special education (GII=36.7%) than did students in programs offering only

Table 14

Percent of Students Having Attended a Two-Year Institution

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	20.4	31.2	28.8	28.2
No	79.0	68.4	70.8	71.3

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 15

Degrees Attained

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
AA	7.6	15.5	8.3	12.8
BA/BS/BEd	6.2	4.4	94.8	90.1
MA/MEd	.6	.8	13.2	12.6
Above MA	.9	.9	3.8	2.6
Other Work	.2	.5	.3	.5

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 16

Area of Concentration

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
AA Degree				
Spec. Ed.	.6	1.3	--	.9
Gen. Ed.	3.0	6.4	2.8	3.4
Other	3.1	5.0	4.5	6.5
BS Degree				
Spec. Ed.	1.2	.7	22.2	36.7
Gen. Ed.	1.9	1.9	34.7	27.5
Other	2.8	1.5	35.1	22.9
MA Degree				
Spec. Ed.	--	.3	5.6	4.8
Gen. Ed.	.3	.1	4.2	3.8
Other	.2	.1	2.1	3.4
Other Degree				
Spec. Ed.	.3	--	1.0	1.0
Gen. Ed.	.2	--	1.7	.7
Other	.6	.8	.7	1.0

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

graduate training (GI=22.2%). Interestingly, a relatively high percentage of our graduate sample had degrees in general education (GI=34.7%; GII=27.5%).

Student Status

We asked students to describe their current status as a student. Looking at the results in Table 17, for undergraduates, almost half our sample indicated they were seniors and those in the category "other" (UI= 29.2%; UII=26.3%) were juniors. About 13% of the undergraduates indicated that they were taking special education courses to either maintain their current certification or to attain a new teaching certification.

Not suprising, the vast majority of graduates are enrolled in a Master's program (GI=80.6%; GII=78.8%). A third of the graduates indicated they were in the program also fulfilling certification requirements.

Enrollment Status

An overwhelming 94% of undergraduates are full-time students (Table 18). Conversely, far fewer graduates (GI=51.7%; GII=38.9%) are enrolled full-time.

These figures can be view in relation to two other pieces of information collected - Work Status, and Location of the College.

Table 17

Student Status

Status	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Senior	47.7	46.3	.7	2.9
5th Year	4.4	8.8	4.9	2.6
Master's	.2	.8	80.6	78.8
New Certification	10.3	11.4	32.3	28.3
Maintenance Certification	2.8	2.4	4.2	7.5
Return Student	16.8	19.1	8.7	8.2
Other	29.2	26.3	5.6	8.4

[a] Multiple responses account for the difference from 100%.

Table 18

Percent of Students Enrolled Full-Time

Full-Time	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	94.9	94.0	51.7	38.9
No	5.0	5.8	48.3	60.6

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Work Status

Less than half the undergraduates are working, and those who are, work less than 20 hours a week (Table 19). On the other hand, most graduates students work (GI=65.3%, GII=73.2%), and the majority work full-time. Of these, 15% of our graduate sample currently teaches in regular education (Table 20).

Location of the Program

Three out of four students attend an in-state college (Table 21), and most colleges are within 50 miles of the students' home (Table 22) meaning they are within driving distance of their program. Undergraduates attending colleges with comprehensive training programs have a stronger tendency to attend an in-state school, and the highest percentage of these students are in a program that is between 100 and 500 miles of their home.

Factors Influencing IHE Selection

Students were asked to rate the extent to which 11 factors influenced their decision to attend their current IHE. Student responses did not vary by size of program therefore data were combined into two categories - all undergraduates and all graduates. The results are presented in Table 23.

Clearly the most important factor in selecting an institution was the availabilty of the particular special

Table 19

Work Status

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Currently Working	44.9	47.8	65.3	73.2
Less than 10 Hrs	8.7	8.4	3.8	2.9
10-20 Hrs.	22.9	22.8	9.4	7.0
20-35 Hrs.	9.2	13.4	16.0	15.2
Over 35 Hrs.	4.2	3.5	36.5	48.5

Table 20

Percent Currently Teaching Regular Education

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	5.6	2.9	16.0	14.5
No	93.9	96.5	83.3	84.3
No Response	.5	.5	.7	1.2

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 21

Location of College

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
In-State	74.3	81.1	75.0	75.4
Out-of-State	25.5	18.7	25.0	24.2
No Response	.2	.1	--	.3

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for the difference from 100%.

Table 22

Distance from Current College to Home

Distance	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Less than 10 mi	16.6	16.6	22.2	20.6
10-50	36.2	25.4	38.2	37.4
50-100	15.9	21.2	11.8	15.5
100-500	24.0	28.4	11.1	12.5
500-100	4.2	3.5	4.5	4.6
1000-2000	.9	3.3	4.2	5.8
Over 2000 mi	1.9	1.3	7.3	2.7
No response	.3	.3	.7	.9

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" accounts for difference from 100%.

Table 23

Factors Influencing Decision to Attend the Current Institution

	Undergraduates			Graduates		
	Not Impt.	Mod. Impt.	Very Impt.	Not Impt.	Mod. Impt.	Very Impt.
Reputation of the Institution	5.6	44.6	47.7	9.5	52.1	34.5
Availability of Program	2.1	16.3	80.5	1.9	15.1	81.2
Job Prospects	6.4	22.6	66.5	18.8	26.5	45.4
Convenience to Home	20.8	37.1	40.3	16.0	30.0	52.1
Cost of Tuition	15.6	43.6	38.4	18.7	40.2	37.3
Living Expenses	23.0	45.3	27.5	45.2	26.9	19.1
Availability of Financial Aid	39.2	24.2	30.9	50.3	17.7	20.3
Opinion of Parents	32.2	42.4	20.8	62.6	21.3	6.5
Opinion of Spouse	48.9	10.5	5.4	51.0	16.6	9.3
High School Counselor	70.6	19.5	3.4	78.3	4.9	2.0
Other Factors	2.1	1.8	9.2	3.0	1.6	7.5

education program (U=80.5%,G=81.2%). The likelihood of getting a good job after graduation was also an important factor influencing students to attend their current school. Convenience to home, the reputation of the institution, and cost were moderately important to very important. The availability of financial aid was of mixed importance. The opinion of parents, a spouse, and high school counselor were not important factors for any student.

Satisfaction With Current Institution

We also asked students to rate eight features of their current institution in terms of satisfaction (1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Neutral, 3=Very Satisfied). Table 24 presents the results of this inquiry.

For both types of students, special education courses, were rated as "Very Satisfactory" by the largest percentage of students - 76.4% of undergraduates and 67.7% of graduates. The reputation of the institution also received relatively strong ratings of "Very Satisfactory" for both groups. Two factors related to expenses, cost of tuition and availablity of financial aid, received a high percentage of ratings of "Not Important" for both groups. Overall, students in our sample were satisfied with all eight aspects of their institution.

Financial Support

Of interest to us were the sources of financial aid available to students in special education teacher training

Table 24

Satisfaction with Current Institution

Influencing Factors	Undergraduates			Graduates		
	Very Dissatisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Neutral	Very Satisfied
Reputation	1.5	27.7	69.2	2.6	35.3	60.2
Social Life	6.1	55.7	37.1	3.1	79.5	14.7
Cost of Tuition	16.3	49.0	33.3	12.3	54.4	31.2
Living Expenses	7.9	61.5	28.4	4.3	70.0	19.1
Sp. Ed. Courses	4.0	18.0	76.4	4.1	25.1	67.7
General Ed. Courses	8.9	42.0	46.2	5.9	60.5	27.7
Availability of Financial Aid	15.6	48.8	32.2	8.1	61.6	24.2
Job Prospects After Graduation	1.6	28.9	67.0	2.0	45.1	47.4

program. Students were asked to check all sources of non-refundable (i.e. grant, assistantships, and scholarships) and refundable (i.e. federal, state and bank loans) financial support available to meet their expenses for the current academic year.

Non-refundable Sources. These sources of financial support include all monies that do not need to be repaid (Table 25). For both groups of students, an overwhelming majority -- 87.8% undergraduates and 86.7% graduates-- depend upon family and personal resources to fund some portion of their education. More graduates receive federal assistantships and over twice as many university assistantships. Undergraduates depend heavily upon scholarships or stipends, work study, and other federal grants.

Refundable Sources. In every category of refundable financial sources, monies that must be repaid, a higher percentage of undergraduates indicated that they use these resources than graduates (Table 26). The most frequently reported types of loan in order, were: Guaranteed Student Loans (U=41.8%, G=24.2%), National Direct Student Loan (U=21.8; G=8.6%), and Bank Loans (U=11.2%, G=8.6%).

Table 25

Sources of Financial Support: Non-Refundable

	Undergraduates	Graduates
Federal Stipends or Assistantships	4.9	11.9
Univ. Stipends or Assistantships	7.4	14.6
Family/Personal Contribution	87.8	86.7
Other Federal Grants	34.5	6.7
Scholarships or Stipends	31.8	14.8
Work Study	23.3	6.0
Other Sources	5.9	5.4

Table 26

Sources of Financial Support: Refundable

	Undergraduates	Graduates
National Direct Student Loan	21.8	8.6
Guaranteed Student Loan	41.8	24.2
IHE Loan	5.8	3.8
State Loan	5.2	3.6
Bank Loan	11.2	8.6
Other Loan	2.5	3.8

Intentions of Pursuing a Career in Special Education

An overwhelming 9 out of 10 students intend to pursue a career in special education (Table 27). The small group of students (9% or less) not pursuing special education careers included general education majors seeking a dual certification in special education.

A series of questions were then posed to students to gather more specific information about the type of teaching situation such as type of community, school setting, type of student, and classroom model they would prefer. For each of these questions students were instructed to make multiple responses if their teaching preferences were diverse.

Type of Community

As Table 28 indicates, most students would prefer to teach in either a small city/town (U=45.6%, G=42.7%) or in a suburban community (U=45.6%, G=35.5%). Only a fourth of the students considered an urban community appealing and less than a fifth would prefer to teach in a rural community.

Type of School

We were also interested in the type of school these students would prefer to teach (Table 29). The largest percentage of students, 63% of all undergraduates and 49.6% of all graduates, want to teach at the elementary level in a

Table 27

Percent of Students Intending to Pursue a Career in Special Education

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	91.6	96.4	89.9	91.3
No	8.4	3.5	9.0	8.2

[a] "no response" or "error in responding" account for the difference from 100%.

Table 28

Type of Community

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Urban	23.8	21.9
Small City or Town	45.6	42.7
Suburban	45.6	35.5
Rural	18.5	16.1

Table 29

Type of School

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Preschool/Public	27.5	15.6
Elementary/Public	63.0	49.6
Secondary/Public	21.0	25.3
Clinic/Hospital	12.5	9.1
Community	14.0	9.4
State/Resid. Institution	11.2	7.3
Private School	28.8	17.0
Other School	2.8	3.9

public school. The next most popular setting was a private school (U=28.8%; G=17%). Fewer students (U=21%, G=25.3%) want to teach at the secondary level.

Type of Student

When asked what type of student they would like to teach (Table 30), all respondents indicated a strong preference for teaching mildly handicapped students particularly the learning disabled. While students were instructed to check all that apply, note that a higher percentage of undergraduate students indicated a preferenace to teach low incidence populations (e.g. Autistic, Severely Handicapped, Deaf, Blind, Physically Handicapped) than graduates. Perhaps this is due to lack of information regarding the necessary skills required to teach such students and greater willingness on the part of the university to allow teacher trainees to consider they have the skills to teach any type of child.

Type of Classroom

As Table 31 shows, the type of classroom prefered by most students was a self-contained class (U=60.4%; G=50.1%) followed by resource room (U=48.2%; G=46%). With the emphasis on educating handicapped students in the least restrictive environment, it is rather surprising that a relatively high percentage of students indicated preferences

Table 30

Type of Student

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Mild Hand.	56.0	38.9
Learning Disabled	59.9	56.8
Mentally Retarded	51.9	32.1
Sev. Emotionally Disturbed/ Behavior Disordered	29.3	24.0
Autistic	23.7	12.1
Severely Handicapped	16.4	10.8
Deaf	19.9	10.6
Blind	11.1	3.9
Phys. Hand.	30.1	11.5
Infant	31.0	18.5
Vocational Ed.	13.6	12.4

Table 31

Type of Classroom

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Self-Contained	60.4	50.1
Resource	48.2	46.0
General Ed.	35.1	19.5
Special Day	33.6	18.7
Multi-Cat.	30.6	23.0
Clinic/Hospital	14.2	10.3
Residential	13.8	9.4
Group Home	13.4	5.4
Vocational Train.	10.7	9.2
Home Instuction	11.5	6.5

for teaching in restricted environments: special day programs, clinic/hospital, and residential settings.

Adequacy of Training

Students were asked to indicate if they felt their training in special education had adequately prepared them for teaching handicapped students. Across all four types of programs (Table 32), the majority of students considered themselves adequately trained. Undergraduates attending comprehensive training institutions tended to be less certain of the adequacy of their training (UII=55.6%), but overall fewer than 10 percent of all students felt they were not adequately trained in special education.

Career Aspirations

A high percentage of undergraduates and graduates alike show a strong preference for assuming or maintaining a direct service role in special education as either a classroom teacher or consultant/specialist (Table 33). Only a very small percentage of the students (U=16.7%, G=16.3%) aspire to administrative positions and even fewer find a university faculty position attractive.

In terms of future plans, more than 70 percent of the undergraduates indicated they plan to pursue graduate training in special eduction (Table 34).

Table 32

Adequacy of Special Education Training

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	61.0	55.6	54.9	59.2
No	4.2	6.0	9.4	7.5
Undecided	25.2	34.3	25.3	24.2
No Response	9.6	4.1	10.4	9.0

Table 33

Career Aspirations

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Classroom Teacher	38.0	51.0
Consultant/Specialist	35.7	36.1
Supervisor/Administrator	16.7	16.3
Higher Ed. Faculty	11.9	10.4
Other Role	5.0	2.8

Table 34

Percent Planning to Pursue Graduate Training in Special Ed.

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	70.1	74.8	83.0	84.3
No	20.7	21.1	5.6	6.8
No Response	9.2	4.1	11.5	8.9

Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Training

Both graduates and undergraduates were asked to select from 3 statements the primary reason for pursuing graduate training. The most frequently selected reason given for pursuing graduate was that the job required graduate training (Table 35). About a quarter of the students took advantage of the open ended response of "Other." The most frequently mentioned written responses were: money, personal/professional interests (e.g. to gain more knowledge, for a challenge, advancement, to learn as much as possible about teaching handicapped students), and to fulfill certification requirements.

Alternative Career

As previously presented in Table 27, a small percent, less than 9 percent, of the respondents indicated they did not intend to pursue a career in special education. We asked these students to check, from a list of 5 options, the alternative that best described their primary career plans following graduation. As shown in Table 36, most of the students indicated they plan to either train or seek employment in other areas.

Further we wanted to know why these students decided not to remain in special education. As shown in Table 37, the response of "Other" drew the highest response; however, very few individuals went on the specify those reasons. We do know from these data that some students had no intention

Table 35

Reasons for Pursuing Graduate Training

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Lack Job Opportunities in My Area	7.4	11.1
Job Requires Graduate Training	32.2	42.8
Other	28.4	26.5
No Response	32.0	19.6

Table 36

Alternative Plans After Graduation

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Training in Other Area	1.9	1.1
Employment in Other Area	1.4	3.1
Homemaking	.1	.3
Undecided	.1	.8
Other	2.1	2.5
No Response	94.3	92.2

Table 37

Reasons for Not Remaining in Special Education

	Undergraduate	Graduate
No Teaching Positions	.1	.4
No Position in Special Ed.	.3	.6
Rewards in Other Areas	.8	1.2
No Intention of Teaching	1.2	.4
Disillusioned with Teaching	.4	.8
Not Sure	.4	.1
Other	3.0	4.6

of teaching (U=1.2%; G=.4%) or found greater rewards in other career areas (U=.8%; G=1.2%).

Career Counseling

The last question asked students if they felt that they had received adequate counseling regarding career choices during their college experience. We found that responses differed by type of student and program (Table 38). Undergraduates, in general, were more satisfied with the career counseling they have received, and those attending smaller progams with slightly more satisfied. On the other hand, only 40% of the graduates feel they had received adequate counseling. Written comments cited the lack of time professors and advisors allow for students in seeking counseling. Many others indicated that they have not sought counseling.

Table 38

Adequacy of Career Counseling

	UI[a]	UII	GI	GII
Yes	59.9	50.2	40.6	39.8
No	36.1	44.5	53.1	55.5
No Response	4.0	5.3	6.3	4.8

SUMMARY

In summary, the typical student in a special education teacher training program is female, Caucasian, attended a public high school, and currently attends a college or university within 50 miles of home. Undergraduates are enrolled full-time and about half work part-time in various jobs. On the other hand, approximately 50 percent of the graduate students attend school part-time, and 43 percent hold a full-time job. Of these, 15 percent are employed as regular education teachers. Among all graduate students, 32 percent held a Bachalor's degree in special education and 29 percent in regular education, thus it seems the majority of these students are simply proceeding in their teaching profession.

Students choose to attend a particular college based primarily on the availability of the desired training program. Other factors influencing their decision to attend the current college are: the prospects of getting a good job after graduation, the reputation of the institution, and the convenience of the school to their home. Overall, students are satisfied with all aspects of their school, particularly the special education courses.

The overwhelming majority of students finance their education with family and personal contributions, but in addition rely on a variety of other financial sources to meet their college expenses. Federal and university assistantships and stipends are typically more available to

graduate students and are a source of aid to 26 percent of these students. Fully 90 percent of the undergraduates rely on scholarships, work study, and federal grant programs to help finance their education. Both undergraduates and graduates indicated Guaranteed Student Loans, National Direct Students Loans, and Bank Loans were also available to them.

In terms of career plans, 90 percent of those currently training in special education intend to pursue a career in special education as a teacher or consultant/specialist. This holds true even for graduate students who forsee themselves in a direct service role rather than as an administrator or supervisor. Although there is no guarantee that all these students will obtain a teaching position, it is encouraging that students appear not to be selecting out of the profession before gruaduation.

The majority of special education trainees would prefer to teach mildly handicapped students, specifically the learning disabled, at the elementary level in a self-contained classroom in a public school. These preferences appear to reflect the orientation of the training program as opposed to the realities of the job market. According to the Seventh Annual Report to Congress (U.S. Department of Education, 1985), during the 1982-83 School Year 67 percent of the 4.3 million students served under P.L. 94-142 received special education services in a resource room while only 26 percent were served in

self-contained classes. Algozzine et al. (1982) also found that at the secondary level only 23 percent of the teachers of emotionally disturbed students sampled taught in a self-contained classroom while 55 percent taught in a resource room. Thus, it is reasonably unlikely that students will teach in their preferred setting.

An additional conflict exists for the large number of students who would prefer to teach elementary level students. Concern has been raised that teachers graduating from special education teacher training programs which emphasize the elementary child rather than the adolescent are not equipped to deal appropriately with secondary students (Grosenick & Huntze, 1980). Considering that many states certify teachers at the K-12 levels, graduates of special education teacher training programs will be able to fill positions at the secondary level. The number of these positions has increased recently as services for secondary students have increased at a rapid rate during the past several years and the types of programs available to these students are being expanded (U.S. Department of Education, 1985). Will prospective teachers be willing to accept teaching positions at the secondary level and will they be satisfied with these positions? Students were confident that their training in special education had adequately prepared them to teach handicapped students; yet, it is uncertain that this confidence extends across all levels.

A final observation concerns the large number of students who want to teach the learning disabled (LD) child. First, of all the disability areas, the area of LD is the only one beginning to show teacher surpluses particularly in suburban and other "desirable" communities. Of more concern, however, is the generic or cross-categorical certification dilemma. approximately 50 percent of the states now have this type of certification that allows teachers to instruct learning disabled, mildly mentally retarded and behaviorally disordered students. There is concern among local special education directors (Smith-Davis et al., 1984) that many of the teachers in these classrooms are unable to deal with the behaviorally disordered child as well as the child with more significant cognitive deficits. Again, the concern is the potential mismatch between the ideal teaching situation and the realities of the job market.

The typical special education student would prefer to teach in a suburban or small town school district rather than an urban or rural community. While the annual attrition rate nationally has been estimated conservatively at 6 percent (Algozzine, 1982) it is not uncommon for rural and remote communities to have a teacher turnover rate as high as 50-75 percent (Smith-Davis, Burke,& Noel, 1984, U.S. Senate, 1980). How can communities attract and retain qualified special education teachers? Also, if a teacher

accepts a position how will it contribute to teacher dissatisfaction and burn-out?

Comparing our data to that of Joyce and colleagues (1977) of almost a decade ago, we find that the special education teacher profession like its regular education counterpart continues to be dominated by females with few minorities represented. The decline in minority representation poses a particular problem for special education in urban areas where a large portion of the special eduction students, specifically the mildly handicapped, are from minority populations. Are new teachers prepared to meet the demands posed by the diverse cultural backgrounds of these students? Also, considering that only a fourth of the teacher trainees preferred to teach in an urban community, these districts are at a definite disadvantage in attracting qualified personnel.

Looking at recruitment of future teachers, the finding that almost half of all students sampled attend a program within 50 miles of their residence, suggests training programs located in large urban communities are in the best position to recruit prospective teachers from minority groups. In addition, given the data that the vast majority of students attended a public high school, training programs may want to consider stronger recruitment efforts in the private high schools.

The demand for graduate training is considerable in that 71 percent of the undergraduate sample plan to seek graduate

training. The fact that approximately 50 percent of the graduate sample are enrolled part-time and live within 50 miles of campus supports recruitment at the local level.

An incidental finding of this study was that small liberal arts colleges are having difficulty maintaining their special education teacher training programs. In conversations with department chairpersons during the sampling procedures, shrinking student enrollment, the expense of maintaining qualified faculty, and consortium agreements with surrounding colleges to meet state accredation requirements were cited as factors contributing to this dilemma.

REFERENCES

Algozzine, B. (1982). Issues in personnel preparation. In J. Ysseldyke & R. Algozzine (Eds.), Issues in special education and remedial education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Algozzine, B., Schmid, R., & Wells, D. (1982). Characteristics of teachers of emotionally disturbed adolescents. Adolescence, 65, 167-175.

Badt, M.I. (1957). Attitudes of university students toward exceptional children and special education.Exceptional Children, 24, 286-290,336.

Blackburn, G.M., Chandler, A.C, & Sowell, V. (1980). The relationship of expressed attitudes and overt behavior among special education preservice teacher. Education, 100, 386-389.

Bowles, S., & Levin, H. (1968). The determinants of scholastic achievement: An appraisal of some recent findings. Journal of Human Resources, 3.

Coffman. L.D. (1911). The social composition of the teaching population. New York:Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., & York, R.L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Falk, W. W., Falkowski, & Lyson, T. A. (1981). Some plan to become teachers: Further elaboration and specification. Sociology of Education, 54, 64-69.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1983). The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Garrison, K.C., & Scott, M.H. (1961). A comparison of the personal needs of college students preparing to teach in different teaching areas. Education and Psychological Measurement, 4, 955-964.

Geiger, W. (1983) 1983 National directory of special education teacher preparation programs. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Greenhoe, F (1941).Community contacts and participation of teachers. Washington, D.C.:American Council on Public Affairs.

Grosenick, J.K., & Huntze, S.L. (1980). National needs analysis in behavior disorders. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri-Columbia.

Guthrie, J. (1971). Schools and Inequality. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Hanuchek, E. (1970). The value of teachers in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp.

Howey, K., Yarger, S., & Joyce, B. (1978). Reflections of preservice preparation: Impressions from the National Survey; Part III: Institutions and programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 38-40.

Joyce, B.R., Yarger, S.J., Howey, K.R., Harbeck, K.M., & Kluwin, T.N. (1977). Perservice education: Report of a survey of the heads of education units, faculty, and students in United States higher education institutions which prepare teachers. Palo Alto: CA.

Joyce, B.R., Howey, K., Yarger, S., Harbeck,K., & Kluwin, T. (1977). Reflection on preserviced preparation: Impressions from the National Survey; Part I: First impressions. Journal of Teacher Education, 25, 14-15.

Joyce, B. R., Morra, F., & Kuuskraa, V.A. (1975).National survey of the preservice preparation of teachers: Questionnaire for students - 1975. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Meisgeier, C. (1965). The identification of successful teachers of mentally or physically handicapped children. Exceptional Children,32, 229-235.

Moffett, M.L. (1929). The social background and activities of teachers college students. New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.

Morrison, H.E. (1968). The relationship of expressed psychological needs of teachers of mentally retarded children to occupational success.Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

Page, F.M., & Page, J.A. (1982). Perceptions of teachers that may be influencing current shortage of teachers. College Student Journal,16, 308-314.

Pavalko, R.M. (1970). Recruitment to teaching: Patterns of selection and retention. Sociology of Education,43, 340-353.

Peng, S. (1977). Transfer students in evaluation of higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES No. 77-250).

Perry, N.C. (1981). New teachers: Do the best get hired? Phi Delta Kappan, 63,113-114.

Rudloff, J.S. (1969). Descriptive profile of teachers of exceptional and non-exceptional children with implications for recruitment. Journal of Educational Research,63, 130-135.

Scheuer, A.L. (1971). The relationship between personal attributes and effectiveness in teachers of the emotionally disturbed. Exceptional Children, 38,723-730.

Schlechty, P. (1984). Restructuring the teaching occupation: A proposal. Paper dprepared for the American Educational Research Association Project: Research Contributions for Educational Improvement.

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V.S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave eduction?: The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan,63,106-112.

Schwarzweller, H.K., & Lyson, T.A. (1978). Some plan to become teachers: Determinants of career specification among rural youth in Norway, Germany, and the United States. Sociology of Education, 51, 29-43.

Smith, B.O. (1980). Pedagogical education: How about reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 87-91.

Smith-Davis, J., Burke, P.J., & Noel, M.M. (1984). Personnel to educate the handicapped in America: Supply and demand from a programmatic viewpoint. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Summer, A. (1975). Equality of educational opportunity qualified: A production function approach. Philadelphia: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Department of Research.

Sykes, F. (1983). Teacher preparation and the teacher workforce: Problems and prospects for the 80s. American Education, 19, 23-29.

Travers, E.F. (1980). The case for teacher education at selective liberal arts colleges. Phi Delta Kappan, 61,127-130.

United States Bureau of Census (1970).Summary: 1970 Census of Population. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Bureau of Census (1980).Summary: 1980 Census of Population. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education (1985). To assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children: Seventh annual report to Congress on the implementation of The Education of the Handicapped Act. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Senate (1980). Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Oversight hearings on education for all handicapped children act.

Wakefield, W.M., & Crowl, T.K. (1974). Personality characteristics of special educators. Journal of Experimental Education, 43, 86-89.

Weaver, W.T. (1978). Educators in supply and demand: Effects on quality. School Review, 86, 552-593.

Westling, D.L., Koorland, M.A., & Rose, T.I. (1981). Characteristics of superior and average special education teachers. Exceptional Children, 47, 357-363.

Yarger, S.J., Howey, K., & Joyce, B. (1977). Reflections on preservice preparation: Impressions from the National Survey; Part II: Students and faculty. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 34-37.

APPENDIX A

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENT SURVEY 1985

PLEASE NOTE:
The information contained in this questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence. Please do not place your name anywhere on this form. Thank you for participating in this survey project.

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN AND YOUTH
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

SECTION ONE

Basic Background Information

This section requests basic descriptive information about you.

You are encouraged to respond to every question that may apply to your situation. If, however, you feel that a question is intrusive or offensive, please feel free to skip it.

1. What is your sex?

   ( ) MALE ( ) FEMALE

2. What is your age? _____

3. How do you describe yourself?

   ( ) BLACK
   ( ) CAUCASIAN
   ( ) ASIAN, ORIENTAL OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
   ( ) HISPANIC
   ( ) AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE
   ( ) OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)_____

4. Are you a citizen of the United States?

   ( ) YES ( ) NO

5. What is your current marital status?

   ( ) SINGLE ( ) MARRIED ( ) OTHER

6. Do you have any children or dependents?

   ( ) NONE ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) MORE THAN 5

7. What is the **principal** occupation of both your mother and father?
   - o If either parent is retired or deceased, please report the principal occupation while working or alive.
   - o Please check only one alternative for each parent.

	FATHER	MOTHER
CLERICAL, SUCH AS BANK TELLER, BOOKKEEPER, SECRETARY, TYPIST, MAIL CARRIER, TICKET AGENT.	( )	( )
CRAFTSMAN, SUCH AS BAKER, AUTOMOBILE MECHANIC, MACHINIST, PAINTER, PLUMBER, TELEPHONE INSTALLER, CARPENTER	( )	( )
FARMER, FARM MANAGER	( )	( )
HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE	( )	( )
LABORER, SUCH AS CONSTRUCTION WORKER, CAR WASHER, SANITARY WORKER, FARM LABORER	( )	( )
MANAGER, ADMINISTRATOR, SUCH AS SALES MANAGER, OFFICE MANAGER, BUYER, RESTAURANT MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL	( )	( )
MILITARY, SUCH AS CAREER OFFICER, ENLISTED MAN OR WOMAN IN THE ARMED FORCES	( )	( )
OPERATIVE, SUCH AS MEAT CUTTER, ASSEMBLER, MACHINE OPERATOR, WELDER, TAXICAB, BUS OR TRUCK DRIVER, GAS STATION ATTENDANT	( )	( )
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR, TEACHERS' AIDE, TEACHER, ADMINISTRATOR, UNIVERSITY FACULTY	( )	( )
OTHER PROFESSIONALS, SUCH AS ACCOUNTANT, ARTIST, CLERGYMAN, DENTIST, PHYSICIAN, REGISTERED NURSE, ENGINEER, LAWYER, LIBRARIAN, UNIVERSITY FACULTY, WRITER, SCIENTIST, SOCIAL WORKER, ACTOR, ACTRESS	( )	( )
PROPRIETOR OR OWNER, SUCH AS OWNER OF A SMALL BUSINESS, CONTRACTOR, RESTAURANT OWNER	( )	( )
PROTECTIVE SERVICE, SUCH AS DETECTIVE, POLICEMAN OR GUARD, SHERIFF, FIREMAN	( )	( )
SALES, SUCH AS SALESMAN, SALES CLERK, ADVERTISING OR INSURANCE AGENT, REAL ESTATE BROKER	( )	( )
SERVICE, SUCH AS BARBER, BEAUTICIAN, PRACTICAL NURSE, PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WORKER, JANITOR, WAITER	( )	( )
TECHNICAL, SUCH AS DRAFTSMAN, MEDICAL OR DENTAL TECHNICIAN, COMPUTER PROGRAMMER	( )	( )
Indicate if either or of both your parents have a college degree(s)?	( )	( )

Educational Background

8. Which of the following best describes the high school from which you were graduated? Please check only one.

( ) PUBLIC
( ) PRIVATE/PAROCHIAL
( ) PRIVATE/SECULAR
( ) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SCHOOL
( ) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SCHOOL
( ) OTHER-INCLUDES EQUIVALENCY CERTIFICATE

9. Are you currently attending school full-time?

( ) YES ( ) NO

10. Which of the following best describes you. Please check all that apply.

( ) SENIOR ( ) FIFTH YEAR ( ) MASTER'S STUDENT
( ) SEEKING NEW TEACHING CERTIFICATE ( ) MAINTAINING CURRENT CERTIFICATION
( ) RETURNING STUDENT
( ) OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE) _____
_____

11. Indicate the number of colleges previously attended.

( ) 0 ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 OR MORE

12. Have you attended any two-year institutions (i.e., junior or community colleges) prior to your present college enrollment?

( ) YES ( ) NO

13. Do you have any of the following degrees?

				Area of concentration
AA	( ) YES	( ) NO	Year awarded: _____	_____
BA/BS/BEd	( ) YES	( ) NO	Year awarded: _____	_____
MA/MEd	( ) YES	( ) NO	Year awarded: _____	_____
OTHER: _____			Year awarded: _____	_____

14. Have you been or are you employed in another area other than Special Education?

( ) YES ( ) NO

Are you currently teaching in regular education?

( ) YES ( ) NO

15. Please describe the location of your current college with respect to your home. If you moved a lot while growing up, please use the location of the high school from which you were graduated as your "home".

Is your current college in the same state as your home?

( ) YES ( ) NO

How far is your current college from your home?

( ) LESS THAN 10 MILES
( ) 10-50 MILES
( ) 50-100 MILES
( ) 100-500 MILES
( ) 500-1000 MILES
( ) 1000-2000 MILES
( ) OVER 2000 MILES

16. Please rate the extent to which each of the following factors influenced your decision to attend your current institution. Check the space which best corresponds to your rating.

	DEGREE OF INFLUENCE		
FACTORS	NOT IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
REPUTATION OF THE INSTITUTION	( )	( )	( )
PROGRAMS AVAILABLE THAT I WANTED	( )	( )	( )
CONVENIENCE TO HOME	( )	( )	( )
COST OF TUITION	( )	( )	( )
LIVING EXPENSES	( )	( )	( )
PARENT'S OPINIONS	( )	( )	( )
SPOUSE'S OPINIONS	( )	( )	( )
HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR	( )	( )	( )
AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL AID	( )	( )	( )
LIKELIHOOD OF GETTING A GOOD JOB AFTER GRADUATION	( )	( )	( )
OTHERS (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____	( )	( )	( )

17. Please rate your current satisfaction with various aspects of your current institution. Check the space which best corresponds to your rating.

ASPECTS	CURRENT SATISFACTION: VERY DISSATISFIED	NEUTRAL	VERY SATISFIED	NO OPINION
REPUTATION	( )	( )	( )	( )
SOCIAL LIFE	( )	( )	( )	( )
COST OF TUITION	( )	( )	( )	( )
LIVING EXPENSES	( )	( )	( )	( )
SPECIAL EDUCATION COURSES	( )	( )	( )	( )
COURSES IN GENERAL EDUCATION	( )	( )	( )	( )
AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL AID	( )	( )	( )	( )
LIKELIHOOD OF GETTING A GOOD JOB AFTER GRADUATION	( )	( )	( )	( )

18. Are you currently working while attending school?
(Not including assistantships, work study)

( ) YES ( ) NO

If you answered YES, how many hours per week do you work?

( ) LESS THAN 10 HOURS
( ) BETWEEN 10 AND 20 HOURS
( ) BETWEEN 20 AND 35 HOURS
( ) OVER 35 HOURS

19. Please indicate the sources of funds available to you to meet your expenses for the current academic year. Check all that apply

Grants or non-refundable resources: This includes all sources that <u>do not need to be repaid</u>.

ASSISTANTSHIPS OR STIPENDS ATTACHED TO FEDERAL PROJECTS	YES ( ) NO ( )
UNIVERSITY ASSISTANTSHIPS OR STIPENDS	YES ( ) NO ( )
FAMILY AND PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS: INCLUDING YOUR OWN EARNINGS, CONTRIBUTIONS FROM YOUR PARENTS, RELATIVES, AND/OR SPOUSE AND WITHDRAWAL FROM SAVINGS	YES ( ) NO ( )
OTHER GRANTS: INCLUDING VETERAN'S BENEFITS, SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS, PELL GRANTS, ROTC, ETC.	YES ( ) NO ( )
SCHOLARSHIPS OR STIPENDS: INCLUDING THOSE PROVIDED BY THE STATE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR YOUR INSTITUTION.	YES ( ) NO ( )
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE WORK/STUDY PROGRAMS	YES ( ) NO ( )
OTHER NON-REFUNDABLE SOURCES (PLEASE DESCRIBE) _____	YES ( ) NO ( )

Loans and other refundable resources: This includes all sources of money <u>which must be repaid</u>.

NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN (FORMERLY THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM)	YES ( ) NO ( )
GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN	YES ( ) NO ( )
LOAN FROM YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	YES ( ) NO ( )
STATE GOVERNMENT GUARANTEED LOAN	YES ( ) NO ( )
PRIVATE BANK LOAN	YES ( ) NO ( )
OTHER LOANS (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____	YES ( ) NO ( )

SECTION TWO

Your Career Plans

This section asks you to describe your future career plans in detail. This information is important in alerting planners to the kinds of jobs that people will be seeking in the next year.

1. When do you expect your degree/certificate?

   ( ) 1985 ( ) 1986 ( ) 1987 ( ) 1988 ( ) 1989

2. Do you intend to pursue a career in Special Education when you complete your degree (or receive your certificate)?

   ( ) YES IF YOU ANSWERED YES, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 3-10.

   ( ) NO IF YOU ANSWERED NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 11.

3. This section contains questions about the type of school in which you might consider working. Indicate both the ideal and the place you will be more likely to find a job.

	IDEAL	PROBABLE
URBAN	( )	( )
SMALL CITY OR TOWN	( )	( )
SUBURBAN	( )	( )
RURAL	( )	( )

4. What type of school?

	IDEAL	PROBABLE
PUBLIC/PRESCHOOL	( )	( )
PUBLIC/ELEMENTARY	( )	( )
PUBLIC/SECONDARY	( )	( )
CLINIC/HOSPITAL INSTITUTION	( )	( )
COMMUNITY BASED SETTING	( )	( )
RESIDENTIAL/STATE INSTITUTION	( )	( )
PRIVATE SCHOOL	( )	( )
OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE)	( )	( )

_____

5. With what type of children would you prefer to work? Check all that may apply.

	IDEAL	PROBABLE
MENTALLY RETARDED	( )	( )
LEARNING DISABLED	( )	( )
SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED/ BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS	( )	( )
MILDLY HANDICAPPED/ EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED	( )	( )
SEVERELY HANDICAPPED	( )	( )
AUTISTIC	( )	( )
DEAF/HEARING IMPAIRED	( )	( )
BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED	( )	( )
PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	( )	( )
INFANT/PRE-SCHOOL	( )	( )
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	( )	( )

6. In what type of classroom organization would you like to work? Check all that apply.

	IDEAL	PROBABLE
MULTI-CATEGORICAL CLASSROOM	( )	( )
GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOM	( )	( )
RESOURCE ROOM	( )	( )
SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOM	( )	( )
SPECIAL DAY SCHOOL	( )	( )
HOMEBOUND INSTRUCTION	( )	( )
RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	( )	( )
VOCATIONAL TRAINING SITES	( )	( )
GROUP HOME	( )	( )
CLINIC/HOSPITAL	( )	( )

7. Do you feel your training in Special Education has adequately prepared you for teaching handicapped students?

( ) YES ( ) NO ( ) UNDECIDED

8. Do you plan to pursue graduate training in special education?

( ) YES

( ) NO **IF YOU ANSWERED NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 11.**

9. If you plan to go to graduate school in special education do you plan to prepare for any of these roles:

CLASSROOM TEACHER	( )
CONSULTANT/SPECIALIST	( )
SUPERVISION/ADMINISTRATION	( )
HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY	( )
OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE)	( )

_____

10. Which of the following best describes your primary reason for pursuing graduate training? Please check one.

( ) THERE IS CURRENTLY A LACK OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN MY AREA OF SPECIALIZATION.
( ) THE JOB THAT I WANT REQUIRES GRADUATE TRAINING.
( ) OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____

_____

11. If you are not planning to stay in the Special Education field please check the alternative which best describes your primary career plans following graduation. Please check one.

( ) GRADUATE TRAINING IN ANOTHER AREA
( ) EMPLOYMENT IN ANOTHER AREA
( ) HOMEMAKING (FULL-TIME)
( ) UNDECIDED
( ) OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE)

_____

12. Please indicate the reasons for this decision. Check all that apply.

( ) I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT I WILL FIND ANY TEACHING POSITIONS.

( ) I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT I WILL FIND A TEACHING POSITION IN MY SPECIALITY, PREFERRED LOCATION, OR SCHOOL.

( ) THERE ARE BETTER REWARDS IN OTHER AREAS OF EMPLOYMENT.

( ) I NEVER INTENDED TO BE A TEACHER.

( ) I HAVE BECOME DISILLUSIONED WITH THE TEACHING PROFESSION.

( ) I AM NOT SURE OF MY REASONS.

( ) OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE) _____

13. During your college career, do you feel you received adequate counseling on career plans.

( ) YES ( ) NO

Please feel free to include any comments here.

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT